

**Four Corners Air Quality Task Force  
Other Sources Work Group Session  
February 7, 2007, 3:00 PM – 5:15 PM  
Durango, Colorado**

**Other Sources Work Group Joint Session with Power Plants Work Group**

\*Other Sources Work Group met with Power Plant Work Group in Colorado room for 1st Hour of session

<b>Attending:</b> Mark Jones, NMED-AQB Rita Trujillo, NMED – AQB Jack Schuenemeyer, SW Statistical Mike Farley, PNM Kim Livo, CDPHE Leona Conger, LWV – La Plata Bill Hagler, NMUSA Mark McMillian, CDPHE Bill Green, NMED-AQB Ethan Hinkley, Southern Ute Envir. David LeMoine, Citizen Maureen Gannon, PNM	Kris Dixon, Citizen Marilyn Brown, LWV David Ruger, Honeywell George Sievers, Citizen Don Anderson, Citizen Jeanne Hoadley, USFS Wilson Laughter, NNEPA Stacey Simms, Amer. Lung Brett Francois, SJBHD Lori Goodman, Dine Care Kelly Palmer, USFS
---	---

The meeting started with an open forum to discuss questions and concerns. These are presented in Q&A format below.

**Q:** *How closely is the state monitoring PNM on stack upgrades?*

**A:** PNM makes quarterly reports to NMED regarding progress on their compliance schedule. They are currently on schedule with construction on the unit 4 baghouse scheduled for October 31m 2007. Unit 3 will be done by next spring with testing on unit 4 to begin about January 1, 2008.

**Q:** *What % of mercury reduction is expected from the upgrades?*

**A:** We won't know for sure until after testing. Between 60-70% reduction (600-900lbs) is expected but it could be as high as 90%.

**Q:** *What is meant by public comment period?*

**A:** Anyone can comment on the mitigation options at any time but so far this has been a formalized process of commenting within the document. The public comment period will target non-task force members and anyone, anywhere can comment on the draft report without inserting directly into the document.

**Q:** *How will word get out to the public that the comment period is open?*

**A:** There was considerable discussion and brainstorming around this questions some of the possible solutions include:

- ads in the local papers
- public service announcements
- American Lung take action notices
- League of Women Voters network
- Mark can identify a subset of people to send Press Releases to their contacts
- POG will address marketing strategy

need to include text of PR in e-mail rather than a link.

**Q:** *What happens after the report goes to the regulatory agencies?*

**A:** States will evaluate the feasibility of implementing various mitigation options and may work with local governments as required. Follow up meetings will be held to report back on what agencies are doing.

**Q:** *What if it becomes political?*

**A:** Agencies will have to assess where they can get the most bang for the buck and which options are most feasible politically. Processes are in place to promulgate rules and regulations and this includes comment and participation by the public to help influence outcomes. With potential strengthening of Ozone standards the area may be in violation and it will then become a State Implementation Plan (SIP) issue.

We may need to strategize for after the Task Force report is done. The November meeting would be a good time to discuss this.

**Q:** *How can the public become more informed about the science behind cleaner energy in order to make informed choices about options for new power plants?*

**A:** This information can be found in the Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) permit under the Best Available Control Technology (BACT) analysis. There is also information about Integrated Gasification Combined Cycle (IGCC) technology in the Task Force draft mitigation options.

**Q:** *Does anyone here know the major emissions for the three Four Corners Power Plants, current and proposed?*

**A:** This can be found in the facility data table on the website.

**Q:** *Is it within the scope of the task force to write up an option to collect data on asthma rates, etc?*

**A:** Nothing is outside the scope of this group. We look forward to including your option in the report.

**Q:** *Why doesn't the Environ report include Power Plants?*

**A:** Because the agencies already have this information as part of their emissions inventory.

**Q:** *How will the EPA use the Task Force report in development of Federal Implementation Plans (FIPs) for Tribes that do not have Tribal Implementation Plans (TIPs)?*

**A:** EPA will have the same option as the States to consider the options presented and determine whether implementation would be feasible and effective.

**Q:** *During the Desert Rock hearing EPA said by law they can allow another Power Plant because the air is clean enough. The monitors they used were in Albuquerque and Bloomfield. How can we get monitors closer to the Desert Rock proposed location?*

**A:** Under current standards and with current monitoring there are no violations of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards in this area. The monitoring group is looking at where there may be gaps and will make recommendations on new or repositioned monitors. EPA is making changes to monitoring protocols for Particulate Matter(PM), this may affect current monitoring due to changes in funding.

If standards are exceeded new restrictions will apply so there is some concern about balancing the representativeness of monitors against the impacts to the population. The states want to know where there is a problem and get monitors out there but budget constrains and EPA budget cuts limit the number of monitors that can be put out there. Monitoring data from the Navajo Nation, and the states are all available online.

## **Review of Mitigation Options from Renewable Energy**

Because of the good discussion documented above there was not time to discuss individual mitigation options. However, several new options have been suggested around renewable energy. These include:

Renewable Energy Credits – Mark M.

Smart Meters – Maureen, Marilyn and Pat Sharpe

CA should consider impacts of imported energy for clean power plants – Don Anderson

## ***Other Sources Work Group Breakout Session:***

### **Attending:**

Rita Trujillo, NMED (work group coordinator); Jeanne Hoadley, USDA Forest Service (Note taker); Brett Francois, San Juan Basin Health Dept; Kim Livo, CDPHE/APCD; Stacey Simms, American Lung Association of the Southwest; Ethan Hinkley, Southern Ute Environmental; David LeMoine, Citizen; Ron Klatt, San Juan National Forest

The first part of the meeting was held jointly with the Power Plants group and is documented separately. In the second part of the meeting members of the Other Sources Group discussed open burning.

Brett Francois provided the county level perspective which is mainly focused on backyard burning.

Some key points from Brett:

- No monitoring except for PM
- Silverton at 9300 ft has inversion issues
  - locals burn coal for heating
- no commercial burning is allowed
- a handout was provided with a list of regulations
- open burning regulation usually consists of a cease and desist order based on a complaint.
- funding cuts have been filtering down from EPA via state
- pollution prevention has precedence over monitoring
- residents can burn only vegetative matter
- Ag burning is exempt
- Fire Dept. sometimes burns without checking for asbestos

**ACTION:** Stacey will look into whether there are EPA certified coal stoves

Ron Klatt gave an overview of smoke management from a land managers perspective

Some key points from Ron:

- Prescribed fire is permitted by the State Air Pollution Control Division
- Burn by burn decision are based on a number of things
  - distance from occupied homes
  - size of burn
  - location relative to community
  - population density determines radius of concern

mitigation practices include:

- notification of home owners
- controlling size of burn
- aerial ignition for hotter, faster burn
- cutoff time of ignition
- smoke problems usually occur at night
- moisture in 1000 hour fuels will limit smoldering
- previous burn within fire return interval
- mechanical treatment
- meteorologist requested for complex burn
- monitoring downstream
- ventilation index – more acres with good dispersion
- control smoke by using appropriate wind direction

**Q:** Do the advantages of Prescribed Burning offset the disadvantages of smoke?

**A:** Yes, because of increased fuels due to suppression increasing wildfire risk

- more brush and trees than 100 years ago as seen on old photos
- harder to put fires out because of fuels increase/climate change
- burning when we can mitigate smoke is better than waiting for an uncontrolled wildfire.
- far more air quality issues with an uncontrolled fire
- society has to decide how much smoke they can put up with in return for the benefits of improved forest health and biodiversity.

Rita Trujillo gave the state perspective

Key points from Rita:

- New Mexico has a three tiered program
- Everyone who burns is regulated
- State has no jurisdiction in Bernalillo County or on Tribal lands
- tiers are based on emissions
- only vegetative material can be burned
- emissions reduction techniques applied to larger burns
- follows Western Regional Air Partnership Fire Emissions Joint Forum guidelines

### **Mitigation Options**

- 1) Public education and outreach on open burning - Stacey
- 2) Agricultural Burning Control in Colorado – Dave and Rita
- 3) Subsidy for cleaner residential fuels – Kim
- 4) Filter Trap for wood stoves – Ethan

Due April 1. Because conference calls have been poorly attended Rita will contact individuals for updates on mitigation options.

Next Meeting: May 9, 2007 Farmington

Other Sources topic will be Mining and Radiation